

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final office action dated December 21, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added. Claim 4 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 15-20 are currently pending, of which claims 15-20 are withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as falling to comply with the written description requirement. In view of the claims as presently amended, applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to comply with written description requirement, as required by the Examiner in the Office Action. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is requested

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,063,339 (to Tisone et al.) (hereinafter "Tisone").

The rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tisone is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over Tisone in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the supports are independently driven from each other so that the syringes at each support dispense dispensing material in the image display parts corresponding to the support and the size of the image display parts of one column is different from that of the image display parts of other column." Tisone does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the claimed invention, M×N display parts are disposed on the substrate and the size of the display parts in one column is different from that of the display parts in the other column, so that the M syringes dispense respectively the dispensing material onto the display parts having different size. However, Tisone does not show this structural feature of the claimed invention.

Tisone merely discloses “Alternatively, multiple dispensers 502 may be used either in parallel, as illustrated in FIG. 2, or independently of one another. Arrays of dispenser heads could also be configured together, spaced, for example, on 4.5 mm or 9 mm center-to-center, so as to provide array dispensing of 8, 16 or 64 drops simultaneously and/or in synchronous coordination. FIG. 2 illustrates a single continuous feed platform 500 configured with multiple dispensers 512 to handle one or more reagents. This particular dispensing apparatus configuration has significant advantages for continuous web production applications since one or more syringe pumps 512 can be operated in alternating succession while allowing the non-dispensing syringe pump to draw additional reagent from the reservoir or they can be configured independent of one another to dispense the same or different reagents simultaneously or in succession.” See column 22, lines 16-31.

That is, Tisone shows only the multiple dispensers disposed parallel to each other, not the dispensers for dispensing the dispensing material onto the display parts having a different size. Thus, Tisone fails to teach or suggest at least “the size of the image display parts of one column is different from that of the image display parts of other column.”

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-9 and 11-12 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2-3, 5-9 and 11-12 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1. As such, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11-12 are allowable over Tisone.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: 21 March 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes Reg. No.  
Eric J. Nuss 53,005  
for Registration No.: 40,106  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant